

h to make our denial as broad and  
sive as the implied accusation of the  
and we wish to do it seriously and  
y. We do not desire to treat the  
and insinuations of the *Freeman*  
a twaddle of the rickety *Brandon Post*.

right to believe that the former party intend to misrepresent it;—while we perfectly that the latter does not intend *any thing else*, in political controversy, therefore ask the *Free-man* to specify.

**Interesting Debates in the Senate.**

—

render a large space, this evening, to that of a debate in the Senate, on Thursday, on the Compromise Bill.

never sufficiently regret the position which the great New England Senator, WEBSTER, has placed himself in, on Slavery; and this vaulted measure, the Compromise. It is without equal parallel! If we could refer to

mortification and sorrow, we should  
We never observed anything so inde-  
an argument, and so ridiculous in  
O, benevolent reader, be good enough  
R? DANIEL WEBSTER says, in his  
of March Speech which Mr. Cat-  
tauland, and which made glad the  
the Slavery propagandists of the  
that he is opposed to the Wilmot Pro-  
posed Slavery can never exist, (being  
by God and Nature) in New Mexico,  
which, where is New Mexico? This  
DANIEL WEBSTER, in the report of his  
last, says: "Texas claims title to a  
of the Territory [of New Mexico];  
he limit, then, within which are the  
of New Mexico and the citizens o  
Texas has exercised jurisdiction over  
PORTION of territory claimed by  
Mexico." But Texas is a relentless  
Organized Slave State, and asserts her  
legislation over its own section of

tion, and that claim is warmly and supported in both Houses of the Congress. Suppose, as appears to be more than likely, she is able to maintain that claim; and thus make "a portion" of New Mexico a Slave territory? Mr. WEBSTER's law of affirmation and Providence, which ever to prevent the existence of Slavery

Evening's Telegraph announced that he had repeated, yesterday, in the Senate, "Slavery could never go into the territory of New Mexico, and therefore he voted the Wilmot Provision." Where and the territory of New Mexico? Texas about the whole of it, and that claim based on Slavery is there already, and remains all time, the laws of geology and "the God" to the contrary notwithstanding! that does Texas *exist* of an immense Territory where, according to Mr. Wilmot, Slavery can never exist? How

Either Texas or Mr. WEAVER is about it—and our opinion is that it is Spanish. We believe, and the people of the country, North and South, believe, that ex-ico is precisely as well adapted,

to the curse of Slavery, as TEXAS or CALIFORNIA, in whose latitude it is; and gland people will insist, at least, before admit that "Slavery cannot exist" in New Texas that it shall be shown that there is no Slavery in Mexico! Where is this happy, though adulterous and rather fabulous, territory, favored by Providence and physical force? By Mr. WEBSTER's own commendable slave-laws of TEXAS are attended over "a LAXITY MORIGIOS" of it! Who are sick and tired of the "elevated" position of Mr. WEBSTER's question. If it is the position of the State of New England we have never been so stupid! But it is not! The Wings of New England, but one alternative for the approval of the Ordinance of '87 to the Territory, and that is the PATRIOTIC PLATFORM of

BY TAYLOR. They are neither shaken  
ruffled (except with regret) by the sledge-  
sophistries of Mr. WEBSTER; and they  
will be. The Ordinance of '87 or the  
Laws of Mexico, is the Whig position,  
cannot be "compromised."  
Our readers will read with pleasure and  
attention the reported remarks of Senator  
Webster. They carry with them the wholeness  
of the Whig Party of the North.

In Senate, June 15.

Senator Webster addressed the Senate. He was  
in favor of each of the measures presented in  
the bill, and would be glad to vote for them  
jointly or separate. The motion now was  
to amend the bill so as to relate to the  
State of Texas; he thought this an important  
matter, as connected with the dis-  
position of the territories. Much difference of

dictated as to what disposition should be made of the territories, but it seemed to be proper that before a decision was made upon disposition of the territories, their boundaries should first be settled. It seemed to him impossible that New Mexico should be annexed as a State unless her boundaries are settled; otherwise, who was to say what were to come together to form a Constitution to a State Government? Texas title to a portion of the territory; where limit then, within which were the people of Mexico and the citizens of Texas? Had exercised her jurisdiction over a portion of territory of New Mexico, and was no government in New Mexico, legislative or judicial; no organized, re- body to resist the claim of Texas, and e their rights against Texas. The of boundary would be a proper one for settlement; but, as a point of practical it was eminently just and proper that

Seward would vote for the amendment, for this reason, among others, that the bill had, in his opinion, been most unfortunate in its operations and tendency. It had made the entire business of Congress to a bill; and California, after six months, was standing at the bar of the Senate waiting; whereas, had she been permitted a separate consideration she would have waited long ago. After alluding to the objections which had been made, in relation to the boundaries of Texas, he said that the argument in favor of those propositions was, that it was better to surrender the Texas territory to the United States than to surrender the territory of the old province of New Spain and all the country lying between the Rio Grande, thus to run the risk of getting the whole of New Mexico. He ended that Texas would get, in the end, much of that country as she was entitled